



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,664	07/12/2001	Jin Soo Lee	24286/81101	2101
37803	7590	04/10/2007	EXAMINER	
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP			PATEL, DHAIRYA A	
555 CALIFORNIA STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 2000			2151	
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104-1715				
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	04/10/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/902,664	LEE ET AL.
	Examiner Dhairya A. Patel	Art Unit 2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-23 and 80-125 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 80-125 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communication filed on 1/17/2007. Claims 80-125 are presented for examination.
2. This amendment has been fully considered and entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 80-90,92-93, 96-98,99-105,107-108, 111-113,114-120,122-123 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Barton et al. U.S. Patent Publication # 2003/0095791 (hereinafter Barton)

As per claim 80, Barton teaches a computer-implemented method for processing description of multimedia content, the method comprising:

-receiving a description about a group of multimedia objects (program guide), the group including a first multimedia object (content name), and the description about the group including a first group identifier (title of tv program) that is a distinct element of the description about the group and identifies the group of multimedia objects (Paragraph 52)(Paragraph 53)(Paragraph 54)

Barton teaches receiving program guide (group of multimedia objects), the program guide including content name (first multimedia object), the description about the program guide, i.e. title of tv program and the time of the day it is going to come.

-comparing the first group identifier with one or more previously stored group identifiers when the first multimedia object is displayed on a terminal (Paragraph 52)(Paragraph 53); and

Barton teaches selecting specific TV program, and an event list which contains selected TV programs, and when the GUI is returned to the web servers, the identifiers of the selected controls are used in conjunction with the program guide (comparing title of tv program with selected TV programs) to create event list.

-if the first group identifier is different from the previously stored group identifiers, storing the description about the group of multimedia objects (Paragraph 53).

Barton teaches storing in the event database, the event list containing the description about the program guide and the event i.e. title of the tv program and the time of the day it is going to come.

As per claim 81, Barton teaches the method of claim 80, wherein the first multimedia object has a first object identifier, the method further comprising:

-storage a usage history that lists user actions and associates the first object identifier with each user action that is related to the first multimedia object (Paragraph 54)(Paragraph 55)(Paragraph 56)(Paragraph 32)

As per claim 82, Barton teaches the method of claim 81, further comprising:

-providing link information in the usage history, wherein the link information is configured to link the description about the group to each user action that is related to the first multimedia object and listed in the usage history (Paragraph 28)(Paragraph 31)(Paragraph 32).

As per claim 83, Barton teaches the method of claim 82, wherein the link information includes the first group identifier (Paragraph 29)(Paragraph 31)(Paragraph 32).

As per claim 84, Barton teaches the method of claim 81, wherein storing the usage history includes storing the usage history without storing the description about the group of multimedia objects if the first group identifier is the same as one of the previously stored identifiers (Paragraph 28)(Paragraph 32).

As per claim 85, Barton teaches the method of claim 81, further comprising:

-receiving a first description describing content in the first multimedia object, the first description including the first object identifier and a reference to the group of multimedia objects, wherein the reference to the group indicates that the first multimedia object belongs to the group of multimedia objects (Paragraph 32)

As per claim 86, Barton teaches the method of claim 85, wherein the reference to the group includes the first group identifier (Paragraph 32)(Paragraph 52).

As per claim 87, Barton teaches the method of claim 85, wherein the group of multimedia objects represents a series of episodes, and wherein the reference to the group indicates that the first multimedia object represents an episode of the series (Paragraph 32)

As per claim 88, Barton teaches the method of claim 87, wherein the reference to the group specifies an episode number for the first multimedia object in the series of episodes (Paragraph 32)(Paragraph 52).

As per claim 89, Barton teaches the method of claim 85, wherein the first description includes a hierarchical structure in which the reference to the group is represented at the same hierarchical level as a container including content description elements (Paragraph 52)(Paragraph 55).

As per claim 90, Barton teaches the method of claim 89, wherein the content description elements include an element describing a title or a genre for the first multimedia object (Paragraph 52).

As per claim 92, Barton teaches the method of claim 89, wherein the content description elements include an element for a textual description of the content in the first multimedia object (Paragraph 32)(Paragraph 52).

As per claim 93, Barton teaches the method of claim 80, wherein the description about the group includes a title for the group of multimedia objects (Paragraph 32)(Paragraph 52)

As per claims 96-98,99-105,107-108 respectively, teaches same limitation as claims 80-82, 84-90,92-93 respectively, therefore rejected under same basis.

As per claims 111-113,114-120,122-123 respectively, teaches same limitation as claims 80-82, 84-90,92-93 respectively, therefore rejected under same basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 91,95,106,110,121,125 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barton et al. U.S. Patent Publication # 2003/0095791 (hereinafter Barton) in view of Kim et al. U.S. Patent # 6,344,879 (hereinafter Kim)

As per claim 91, Barton teaches the method of claim 89, but is silent on teaching wherein the content description elements include an element specifying a director, an actor, or an actress for the first multimedia object. Kim teaches the content description elements include an element specifying a director, an actor, or an actress for the first multimedia object (column 1 lines 26-31, lines 45-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Kim's teaching in Barton's teaching to come up with having actor, director or actresses for multimedia object. The motivation for doing so would be so that viewer/user can sort or watch the program guide according to the type of favourite actor, actress, or director.

As per claim 95, Barton teaches the method of claim 80, but is silent on teaching wherein the description about the group specifies a director or one or more actors or

actresses for the group of multimedia objects. Kim teaches the description about the group specifies a director or one or more actors or actresses for the group of multimedia objects (column 1 lines 26-31, lines 45-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Kim's teaching in Barton's teaching to come up with having actor, director or actresses for group of multimedia objects. The motivation for doing so would be so that viewer/user can sort or watch the program guide according to the type of favourite actor, actress, or director.

As per claims 106, 110 respectively, teaches same limitation as claims 91,95 respectively, therefore rejected under same basis.

As per claims 121,125 respectively, teaches same limitation as claims 91,95 respectively, therefore rejected under same basis.

5. Claims 94,109,124 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barton et al. U.S. Patent Publication # 2003/0095791 (hereinafter Barton) in view of Cragun et al. U.S. Patent # 5,973,683 (hereinafter Cragun)

As per claim 94, Barton teaches the method of claim 80, but is silent on teaching wherein the description about the group specifies a genre for the group of multimedia objects. Cragun teaches wherein the description about the group specifies a genre for the group of multimedia objects (Fig. 3, "violence, sex, language") (column 12 lines 43-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Cragun's teaching in Barton's teaching to come up with having group description specifying genre for the multimedia objects. The

motivation for doing so would be so that the user/viewer watching the tv programs can sort the program guide or multimedia object according to the genre type.

As per claim 109, it teaches same limitations as claim 94, therefore rejected under same basis.

As per claim 124, it teaches same limitations as claim 94, therefore rejected under same basis.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 80-125 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
 - A). "Method for increasing the functionality of a media player/recorder device or an application program" by Cox et al. U.S. Patent # 6,456,725.

7. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days** from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the applicant (see 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P 710.02, 710.02(b)).

8.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dhairy A. Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-5809. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on 571-272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DAP



ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER